

Supreme Court, U. S.  
**FILED**  
OCT 11 1979  
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

---

**In the**  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1979

No. **79-592**

LARIMER COUNTY DEPARTMENT  
OF SOCIAL SERVICES, THE BOARD  
OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF  
LARIMER COUNTY, THE COLORADO  
STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL  
SERVICES, ARMANDO RATENCIO,  
MARTIN C. COKER, DOUGLAS  
KEASLING, LARRY R. LONG,  
BENJAMIN F. NAPHEYS III, DAVID  
WEITZEL, NONA THAYER, and  
WILLIAM LOPEZ,

*Petitioners,*

vs.

THE HONORABLE JOHN L. KANE, JR.,  
United States District Judge for the  
District of Colorado, and DAVID  
BRYAN PIRENTE,

*Respondents.*

---

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

---

**ELLIOTT & GREENGARD**  
Richard D. Greengard  
Robert E. Crane  
50 South Steele Street, Suite 700  
Denver, Colorado 80209  
Telephone: 320-0509

*Attorneys for Petitioners*

---

## INDEX

	Page
OPINIONS BELOW .....	2
JURISDICTION .....	2
QUESTIONS PRESENTED .....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES, AND RULES INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	3
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	5
CONCLUSION .....	8
APPENDIX .....	10

## CITATIONS

### CASES:

Detroit Edison Co. v. NLRB, —— U.S. ——, 99 S.Ct. 1123 (1979) .....	5,6
Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965) .....	6
Kerr v. United States District Court for the Northern District of California, 426 U.S. 394 (1976) .....	5
Keyes v. Lenoir Rhyne College, 552 F.2d 579 (4th Cir. 1977) .....	6
Lora v. Board of Education of the City of New York, 74 FRD 565 (E.D. N.Y. 1977) .....	6,7
Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 (1925) .....	7
Sierra Club v. Morton, 405 U.S. 727 (1972) .....	7

<i>CASES (Continued)</i>	Page
Usery v. Ritter, 547 F.2d 528 (10th Cir. 1977) .....	7
 <i>CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES:</i>	
United States Constitution Amendment Five .....	3
United States Constitution Amendment Fourteen .....	3
Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. Sections 1983, 1985(3), and 1988) .....	2,3
28 U.S.C. 1254(1) .....	2
 <i>FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE:</i>	
Rule 26 .....	3
Rule 30 .....	2,3
Rule 33 .....	2,3
Rule 34 .....	2,3

# **In the Supreme Court of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1979

No. \_\_\_\_\_

**LARIMER COUNTY DEPARTMENT  
OF SOCIAL SERVICES, THE BOARD  
OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF  
LARIMER COUNTY, THE COLORADO  
STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL  
SERVICES, ARMANDO RATENCIO,  
MARTIN C. COKER, DOUGLAS  
KEASLING, LARRY R. LONG,  
BENJAMIN F. NAPHEYS III, DAVID  
WEITZEL, NONA THAYER, and  
WILLIAM LOPEZ,**

*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

**THE HONORABLE JOHN L. KANE, JR.,  
United States District Judge for the  
District of Colorado, and DAVID  
BRYAN PIRENTE,**

*Respondents.*

---

## **PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

---

The above-named Petitioners, by their attorneys, ELLIOTT & GREENGARD, pray that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit entered in the above case on September 18, 1979.

## OPINIONS BELOW

The District Court's ruling with regard to the discovery matters now before the Court was issued from the bench during proceedings held on August 24, 1979. The District Court's ruling is further set forth in a Protective Order issued on September 13, 1979. The United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit rendered no opinion on the Petitioners' Petition for Writ of Mandamus and instead issued a summary denial on September 18, 1979 (Sept. Term, No. 79-2005).

## JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was made and entered on September 18, 1979, and copies thereof are appended to this Petition in the Appendix at page 10. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

## QUESTION PRESENTED

In a civil action commenced pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Sections 1983, 1985(3), and 1988, Respondent Pirente sought discovery, under Rules 30, 33, and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, of information and documents contained in the personnel files of the Respondents' co-workers at the Larimer County Department of Social Services. The Petitioners interposed an objection of privacy and confidentiality in the District Court on the ground that disclosure of the requested information would seriously hamper the effectiveness of the employee evaluation system of the Larimer County Department of Social Services and would cause a serious breach of the privacy rights of both the supervisors who rendered the evaluations contained in the personnel files and the employees who are the subjects of those files. The District Court nevertheless ordered the requested documents disclosed subject only to the limited restrictions contained in the Protective Order issued on September 13, 1979. The Petitioners sought relief by way of a Petition for Writ of

Mandamus to the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals. However, the Court of Appeals denied that Petition without briefing or argument on September 18, 1979. The questions presented are:

1. Did the District Court usurp its power by ordering the discovery of the privileged and confidential documents relating to employee personnel files and thereby make relief by way of Writ of Mandamus and Prohibition appropriate in this case?

2. Can a government employee seeking redress from termination by means of a lawsuit styled as a deprivation of civil rights be perfunctorily permitted to engage in broad discovery encompassing all personnel information relating to other employees of the governmental agency from which he was terminated?

3. Even if such a plaintiff is permitted to gain disclosure of some of the information relating to government agency personnel, can such disclosure be ordered by the Court without an accompanying Protective Order tailored to protect the privacy interests of the agency supervisors and employees?

## CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES, AND RULES INVOLVED

The pertinent provisions of Amendments Five and Fourteen of the United States Constitution, 42 U.S.C. Sections 1983, 1985(3) and 1988, and Rules 26(b)(1), 30, 33, and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are relevant to the discovery issue in this case.

## STATEMENT OF CASE

The Respondent Pirente commenced this Civil Action No. 79 K 109 in the United States District Court, District of Colorado for his alleged wrongful termination by the Petitioners. His Complaint included the allegation that the Defen-



dants fired him in retaliation for his exercise of First Amendment rights. The Respondent Pirente, through requests for documents, interrogatories and oral depositions, sought to obtain the personnel files and other privileged information concerning employees of the Department of Social Services not parties to this litigation. The Petitioners, who include the Chief Executive Officers of Larimer County and the Directors of the Department of Social Services, have refused to provide the information requested on the grounds that it is confidential, privileged, and not calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information. The Petitioners have offered to provide the requested information on either an identity-deleted basis or, in its entirety, if the employees who are the subject of the said personnel files give knowledgeable consent to disclosure.

The Respondent-Plaintiff filed a "Motion for Determination with Respect to Discovery" seeking an Order from the District Court requiring the Petitioners to disclose the requested information and documents. On August 24, 1979, Respondent District Court Judge John L. Kane, Jr. made a ruling from the bench that the Petitioners were required to disclose the requested information. The District Court issued a Protective Order on September 13, 1979 which limits the Respondent Plaintiffs access to and use of the personnel information only in that "the same shall not be used by Plaintiff's counsel or representatives for any purpose not directly related to this lawsuit."

The Respondent-Plaintiff demanded immediate compliance with the Court's Order respecting discovery. Once the confidentiality of this information is breached, irreparable harm is done to both the effectiveness of the employee evaluation system and the privacy rights of the employees. Hence, rather than waiting for a final judgment and perfecting an appeal, the Petitioners sought immediate relief by way of Writ of Mandamus from the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. On September 18, 1979, the Petition for Writ of Mandamus was denied by the Tenth Circuit. Realizing the same need to protect the confidentiality of this information from its imminent breach, the Petitioners now seek relief

from this Court by way of Petition for Writ of Certiorari to review the Court of Appeals' decision to deny the Petitioners' Request for Writ of Mandamus.

### REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The decision below should be reviewed because it erroneously permits the District Court to usurp its power by permitting the Respondent-Plaintiff to gain access to privileged and confidential documents and information without any limitation in scope or a protective order designed to protect the confidentiality interests of the Department of Social Services or the privacy interests of the employees of that agency. This decision if unreversed, poses a threat to the privacy rights of all government employees. The decision below is in conflict with the decision of this Court in *Detroit Edison Co. v. NLRB*, \_\_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_\_, 99 S.Ct. 1123 (1979), and, it poses questions of first impression left undecided by that case. In any event, this Court should grant review.

1. It has been the policy of the Department of Social Services to maintain the confidential and privileged status of the information sought by Respondent Plaintiff. The objection on the basis of privilege has been interposed by the highest ranking officials in the Larimer County government as required by *Kerr v. United States District Court for the Northern District of California*, 426 U.S. 394 (1976). The Petitioners have also made efforts to compromise with the Respondent-Plaintiff by fashioning a means for providing the requested information without damaging the effectiveness of the evaluation system or breaching the privacy interests of the Social Services Department employees. Petitioners have offered to provide the requested personnel information on a name-deleted basis or, in its entirety, if the employees in question waive their privilege. Thus, the Petitioners' efforts have not been limited to blanket assertion of privilege, but rather have included good faith efforts to claim only the privilege that is essential to protect the privacy interests outlined herein.

2. In order to be an effective means of employee evaluation, the system utilized by the Petitioners requires open and candid comment by the supervisors making the evaluations. Disclosure of these confidential evaluations will chill future candidness on the part of the evaluating supervisors and will substantially hamper the ability of the Department to receive adequate and honest evaluations of its employees. This lawsuit does not pose the situation of a class action wherein personnel documentation is necessary to show a historical pattern of discrimination or unconstitutional conduct by supervisory personnel, but rather is an action by a single employee seeking redress from his own isolated incident of termination. Nor is this a case where the Defendant executives have attempted to set up their personnel records as a means of defense. *Keyes v. Lenoir Rhyne College*, 552 F.2d 579 (4th Cir. 1977). Thus in this case, it is clear that any tangential relevance of co-employees' personnel files to the Respondent-Plaintiff's claim is clearly outweighed by the need to maintain the files' confidentiality.

3. The importance of the privacy interests of the Respondent Plaintiffs' fellow employees in the Department of Social Services is of the highest order. This Court has recognized the importance of those privacy interests in the analogous case of *Detroit Edison Co. v. NLRB*, *supra*. As Mr. Justice Stewart stated at 99 S.Ct. 1133:

The sensitivity of any human being to disclosure of information that may be taken to bear on his or her basic competence is sufficiently well known to be an appropriate subject of judicial notice.

The privacy rights of individual citizens have been recognized to be of sufficient magnitude to warrant the protection of the United States Constitution. *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965). The employees have a genuine interest in seeing that the intimate biographical details contained in their personnel files not be laid bare to the world. *Lora v. Board of Education of the City of New York*, 74 FRD 565 (E.D. N.Y. 1977).

This Court should consider the privacy rights of the agency employees in this case even though those employees are not actually parties to the litigation. The Department of Social Services, absent a showing of bad faith, is a proper party to assert the rights of its members. *Sierra Club v. Morton*, 405 U.S. 727 (1972). Similarly, the Department of Social Services and its Directors are engaged in an ongoing relationship with the department employees who will be adversely affected by disclosure of the requested information. *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925). Furthermore, it would be difficult and unduly burdensome to those employees to intervene in this litigation to protect their own privacy interests.

4. The Petitioners do not seek to assert a blanket privilege with regard to the documents and information requested, but rather to balance the confidentiality of that information with the Respondent Plaintiff's need for the information without unduly compromising the effectiveness of the evaluation system and the privacy rights of the department employees. The Protective Order issued by the Respondent-District Court in this case will not adequately protect either of those interests and thus the District Court abused its discretion by not issuing an Order which is aimed at balancing the privileged status of this information and the Respondent-Plaintiff's need for the information in this litigation. See, *Usery v. Ritter*, 547 F.2d 528 (10th Cir. 1977); *Lora v. Board of Education of the City of New York*; *supra*.

5. The questions presented by this case are of great and recurring significance to the administration of government employee termination cases brought pursuant to the Civil Rights Act. Failure to grant review at this stage of the litigation will force the Petitioners to either breach the confidentiality, which will then permanently negate any utility in asserting it in the future, or expose themselves to the District Court's sanctions for failure to make discovery. The serious questions of public policy involved herein and the effect of the decision below, if unreversed, make this case a peculiarly appropriate one for the exercise of this Court's discretionary jurisdiction.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that this Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

ELLIOTT & GREENGARD

By Richard D. Greengard  
Richard D. Greengard

By Robert E. Crane  
Robert E. Crane

Attorneys for Petitioners  
50 South Steele Street, Suite 700  
Denver, Colorado 80209  
Telephone: 320-0509

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit has been mailed this 8th day of October, 1979 to:

Lynn D. Feiger, Esq.  
Feiger & Lawson  
1624 Market Street, Suite 205  
Denver, Colorado 80202

Honorable John L. Kane, Jr.  
United States District Court  
District of Colorado  
C-145 U.S. Court House  
Denver, Colorado 80294

Solicitor General  
Department of Justice  
Washington, D.C. 20530

Richard D. Greengard

## APPENDIX

## SEPTEMBER TERM — September 18, 1979

Before Honorable Robert H. McWilliams, Honorable Jean S. Breitenstein and Honorable William E. Doyle, Circuit Judges

LARIMER COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF	)	
SOCIAL SERVICES, THE BOARD OF	)	
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF	)	
LARIMER COUNTY, THE COLORADO	)	
STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL	)	
SERVICES, ARMANDO RATENCIO,	)	
MARTIN C. COKER, DOUGLAS KEASLING,	)	
LARRY R. LONG, BENJAMIN F.	)	
NAPHEYS III, DAVID WEITZEL, NONA	)	
THAYER, and WILLIAM LOPEZ,	)	
	)	
<i>Petitioners,</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 79-2005
	)	
THE HONORABLE JOHN L. KANE, JR.,	)	
United States District Judge for	)	
the District of Colorado, and	)	
DAVID BRYAN PIRENTE,	)	
	)	
<i>Respondents.</i>	)	

This matter comes on for consideration of a petition for writ of mandamus.

Upon consideration whereof, it is ordered that the petition for writ of mandamus is denied.

/s/ Howard K. Phillips

HOWARD K. PHILLIPS, Clerk